



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,209	08/03/2001	John David West Brothers	9339/34809	7950
24728 7590 03/20/2007 MORRIS MANNING MARTIN LLP 3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE 1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER ATLANTA, GA 30326			EXAMINER HOSSAIN, TANIM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/922,209	BROTHERS, JOHN DAVID WEST	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tanim Hossain	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8, 10-31 and 39-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 32-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

This application contains claims drawn to inventions nonelected with traverse in Applicant's remarks dated March 8, 2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (U.S. 6,529,956).

As per claim 9, Smith teaches a method comprising the steps of: retrieving data for a web page document including a URL of one or more resources referenced in the web page document (column 2, lines 25-40; where in the process of generating the PURL, the document URL is retrieved to be presented along with the web page document); retrieving resource access

right data for the URL using the IP address of the WAD and/or user name and password established through a login procedure (11; 62-65, 13; 60-65, 15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); generating hash and/or encrypted data to generate secure resource access right data (5; 40-60); combining the secure resource access right data with the respective URL to generate a secure URL (2; 25-40, 11; 39-54, 17; 20-27); generating a document including the secure URL that can be used to generate a request for the one or more resources (2; 25-40, 16; 35-59); and transmitting the document including the secure URL to the WAD (11; 39-54, 2; 25-40). Smith teaches receiving a signal at a web server requesting a web page document from a WAD, the signal including an IP address of the WAD, and that the secure URL is transmitted to the user, but does not specifically teach that the document with the secure URL is a web page document, that the request is made before the generation of the secure URL, and that the initial request is the trigger for the process of URL generation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to have a user-triggered PURL generation to allow for the user to have control if he/she wants to access a certain sensitive document. This would lead to further diversity of the invention, such that secure URLs can be generated on an as-needed basis, but would still be subject to the verification of data access rights. Further, the use of a web page document to transmit the secure URL constitutes a design choice. Given that Smith has anticipated the generation of secure URLs using user-information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extend this teaching such that the user initiates the generation of the secure URL.

As per claim 32, Smith teaches a method comprising the steps of: receiving a signal requesting access to a resource, the request signal including a URL, secured resource access right

data, and an IP address of a device requesting access to the resource, and hash data, wherein the request signal was generated from a link containing a secure URL combining the hash data, URL, and secured resource access right data (13; 33-46, 15; 30-40); verifying whether key data is valid based on data corresponding to the key data in a secure content key database (13; 60-65); if the key data is verified as valid in step (b), generating hash data based on at least the key data (15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); and verifying that the hash data generated matches the hash data included in the request signal received (15; 30-40). Smith does not specifically teach that the request signal is generated from a web page, and that the verification steps take place in response to receiving the signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include that the verification process of receiving a signal takes place after receiving the signal. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that the verification would allow for enhanced security, such that if a user used a link erroneously obtained, there exists safeguards to prevent the user from accessing private data meant for a different user. Given that Smith already teaches the tracking of IP addresses to prevent wrong IP addresses from accessing the data corresponding to the PURL, and the verification of hash data, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to specifically dispose this teaching as claimed. Further motivation is also discussed in the treatment of claim 1. Smith does not specifically teach that the hash data is generated based on the IP address and URL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include that the IP address and URL are used to form hash data. Given that Smith teaches the use of an IP address as an enforcement tool for security, such that only valid IP addresses are allowed to access the data, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this and the URL to form hash data, as it would

enable another level of security, such that non-matching hash data is disallowed access to the documents. Further the use of these entities to form hash data is well known in the art of access control, and therefore its specific inclusion would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Smith.

As per claim 33, Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, further comprising the steps of: terminating the request signal if the verifying of the step (d) indicates that the hash data generated in the step (c) does not match the hash data included in the request signal received in the step (a) (13; 60-65).

As per claim 34, Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 33, further comprising the steps of: determining whether access to a resource is to be provided to a device identified by the IP address, based on the resource access right data included in the request signal (15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); and providing access to the resource to a device identified by the IP address if the determining of the step (f) indicates that access to the resource is to be provided (15; 57-62, 16; 15-25).

As per claim 35, Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 34, further comprising the steps of: retrieving resource access right data from a database, the determining of step (f) based further on whether the IP address of the request signal is authorized to access the resource indicated by the URL of the request signal, based on the retrieved resource access right data (13; 60-65).

As per claim 36, Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, wherein the request signal received in step (a) includes key index data, the method further comprising the step of: retrieving the key data from the secure content key database using key index data (13; 32-46).

As per claims 37 and 38, Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, but does not specifically teach time-to-live considerations in dealing with the validity of key data. Official notice is taken that the consideration of time-based data in creating and using keys is well known in the art of key generation and manipulation (Please see paragraph 373 of U.S. 2004/0170176, as an example). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include time-to-live considerations in the system of Smith, to allow for situations where sessions may be timed out, so that security is maintained.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on December 8, 2006 have fully been considered.

a. Applicant asserts that key data verification takes place for a sender of a document and not a recipient. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The keys in Smith are used for communication in both ways, such that the sender can be subject to key verification, and that the user of a link is also subject to key verification (column 15, lines 30-41; column 16, lines 25-35; where the teaching of a requestor being subject to a key is discussed). Further, the entity subject to key verification is irrelevant with regard to the claim language, as it does not discuss whether the recipient or sender should be subject to it.

b. All remaining arguments are respectfully traversed by the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2145



JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER